DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 059 TM 009 967

AUTHOR Ferrara, Barbara F.; Redemer, Merrill
TITLE Evaluation Report of the Title VII Emergency School Aid Act Program of the Springfield Public Schools.
INSTITUTION Sangamon State Univ., Springfield, Ill.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *Counseling Programs; Cultural Awareness; Educational Diagnosis; Elementary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Low Achievers; Parent Reaction; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Remedial Programs; School Integration; Self Concept Tests; Socially Disadvantaged; Teacher Attitudes; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS Emergency School Aid Act 1972; Illinois (Springfield); Springfield Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

Three discrete programs were evaluated by comparing students' pretest-posttest results, and by surveying teachers, principals, and parents for their perceptions of the programs and recommendations for improvement. Over 500 students, referred to student relations specialists because of personal or social problems, showed statistically significant gains on the Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale after four to seven months of counseling. Teachers and principals were satisfied with the promptness of treatment: 80% rated the programs as extremely or somewhat helpful. Only 27% of the parents returned their survey; many who responded were unfamiliar with the program. Over 500 low achieving students referred to diagnostic prescriptive specialists were tested, before and after remedial instruction, on the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, Woodcock Reading Mastery Test, and the Keymath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test. Grade equivalent changes after one to eight months were positive, but not always statistically significant or applicable to all grades. Teachers and principals were very satisfied with the program. Teachers completed a cultural awareness scale before a workshop and two months later, after teaching a corresponding unit. Their attitude change was not statistically significant, suggesting that the workshop attracted teachers who were culturally aware upon entering. (Questionnaires are appended). (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181059

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation Report of the Title VII Emergency School Aid Act Program of the Springfield Public Schools

June 1979

Barbara E. Ferrara

Merrill Redemer

TM009 967

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Merrill Redemer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Sangamon State University

Springfield, Illinois

Evaluation Report of the Title VII Emergency School Aid Act Program of the Springfield Public Schools

June 1979

Barbara E. Ferrara

Merrill Redemer

Sangamon State University

Springfield, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION INTRO-1

STUDENT RELATIONS SPECIALIST PROGRAM SRS-1

- Nature of the Program 1
- Evaluation Procedures 1
- Test Results 3
- Perceptions of Participating Professionals and Parents 5
- Concluding Observations and Recommendations 9

DIAGNOSTIC/PRESCRIPTIVE SPECIALISTS PROGRAM DPS-1

- Nature of the Program 1
- Evaluation Procedures 1
- Math Test Results 3
- Reading Test Results 6
- Perceptions of Participants 11
- Concluding Observations and Recommendations 17

MULTI-CULTURAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER MCC-1

- Nature of the Program 1
- Evaluation Procedures 1
- Results of the Cultural Awareness Scale 5
- Perceptions of Participants 14
- Concluding Observations and Recommendations 21

APPENDIX

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team found all Title VII staff with whom they worked cooperative, congenial and happy to provide insights into program operations that were necessary for this effort. Data provided by the staff were accurately and punctually made available.

Special thanks is extended to Dr. Roger W. Huson, Title VII Director, Marilyn Cobb and Rosemary Reichstetter, spokespersons for the DPS program, Larry Moose, spokesman for the SPS program, LaVon Wilson, MCC specialist, and Nettie Cook, Title VII secretary.

Acknowledgement of the teachers, principals and aides who took the time and effort to complete and return the questionnaires must also be made. The same recognition is deserved by the sample of parents who responded.

Faculty colleagues of the evaluation team, Professors Chris Breiseth, John Collins, Martin Jaeckel and Norman Langhoff, who shared valuable professional perspectives and ideas in developing the Cultural Awareness Scale, deserve a special vote of thanks.

The panel that responded to the MCC instrument to form the baseline for subsequent analysis shared perceptions that were not available from any other source.

And last, but certainly not least, recognition of the fine secretarial support of Ms. Joyce Still is acknowledged and appreciated.

Without these fine collaborative efforts this evaluation would not have been possible. As a result of these efforts, the evaluation was a pleasant task.

Barbara E. Ferrara

Merrill Redemer

INTRODUCTION

Background

Funds were granted during the 1978-79 school year to the Springfield Public Schools to conduct programs to overcome educational deficiencies relating to previous racial isolation in the school district. The grant award was made by the U.S. Office of Education; funding authorization was Title VII of the Emergency School Aid Act. Under provisions of that Act, only school districts that had implemented desegregation plans could qualify.

This was the second year of such funding and programs under this entitlement for the Springfield Schools. The primary focus of the year's program activity, therefore, was to further develop and refine programs that had been initiated during the first year of Title VII activity.

Program Descriptions

There are three distinct programs included in the Title VII operation. These programs were directed by a Title VII director who was responsible for the overall direction and supervision of program activity.

The Student Relations Specialist program is designed to assist students who experience personal or social problems that detract from their academic efforts. A student relations specialist worked with students on an individual or in some cases a group basis to provide psychological support and guidance. In addition to working directly with students, these specialists also contacted teachers, parents and community agencies if the student's problems warranted such interaction. Students were eligible if they were identified as needing the program services by teachers, principals, parents or themselves.

A staff of eight student relations specialists was assigned to the various elementary schools of the district. Their headquarters were located in the Lincoln Elementary School. Services, however, were provided to students in the attendance centers where they were enrolled.

The Diagnostic/Prescriptive Specialist program is designed to provide remediation to elementary students who are behind in their academic performance. Students who were identified by classroom teachers or principals as needing remedial work were referred to the DPS staff. A staff member would then visit the school to which she was assigned, assess the level of academic performance as well as the learning style of the student, and prescribe materials and activities to overcome those deficits. The DPS would also prepare learning packets and provide them for the student's use. An aide who was assigned to that school worked with the student using the materials on an individual basis or in some cases with small groups. The principal subject areas that were addressed were reading and mathematics.

There were eight diagnostic/prescriptive specialists assigned to the various elementary schools of the district. Twenty aides were divided among the schools which meant that a few aides were required to serve two schools. While the aides were assigned to specific attendance centers, the specialists operated from the Lincoln Elementary School as described above.

The Multi-Cultural Staff Development Center is designed to allow elementary teachers time, materials and assistance to develop an instructional unit for subsequent use in their classroom. The instructional unit can be on any subject of the teacher's choice, but must be designed to emphasize awareness of cultural differences.

Typically, approximately four teachers who were scheduled to attend the center in any given week would spend Tuesday through Friday at the Center which

is located at Matheny Elementary School. Monday of that week was devoted to working witn the substitutes who would staff their classes while the teachers were at the Center.

At the Center teachers worked with a wide array of media and materials to develop their units. A specialist was there to help them with their unit as well as to provide guidance and direction.

A copy of the instructional unit was retained by the Center to be used by any teacher in the district. Participating teachers and the specialist scheduled followup visitations by the specialist in conjunction with the teaching of the unit in the classroom.

Evaluation Design

The focus of the evaluation was limited to the three programs described above. No attempt was made to assess the relative significance of these programs to other programs of the district and no effort to establish cost-benefit relationships was attempted.

Two evaluation consultants from Sangamon State University in conjunction with the Title VII director and spokespersons from each of the three programs agreed on the strategies and methodologies involved. Instrumentation, sampling, analysis, and reporting were the responsibilities of the consultants. Data collection was done by program staff and consultants as reported in the separate sections of this report.

The two primary concerns of the evaluation were the impact on program recipients and perceptions of professional educators who were involved in some way with the program. In the SRS program a sample of parents was also surveyed, for parental involvement was one aspect of that program.

The impact on program recipients was assessed on a pretest-posttest basis, for no comparable control groups were readily available. Students were identified as program recipients for the SRS and DPS program while participating

teachers were the recipients of the MCC program.

Perceptions were assessed to indicate strengths and weaknesses of the programs for aiding in subsequent program improvement and refinement. In some instances, summative judgements were also solicited, for it is assumed that particularly classroom teachers and principals are in strategic positions to observe changes in students' behavior and academic performance.

Since each of the three programs is discrete in its operation, the evaluation reports are prepared to reflect that individuality.

STUDENT RELATIONS SPECIALIST PROGRAM

Nature of the Program

This program is designed to provide assistance to elementary students who are experiencing personal or social problems that detract from their academic performance.

Students who are observed to be in need of such services are typically referred by a teacher, and in some cases by a parent or principal. A staff of eight specialists was divided among the various elementary schools of the district. Individual staff members visited the schools to aid the referred students by counseling with the student or by taking whatever action was required to assist the student in coping with or overcoming the problem. In many instances the Student Relations Specialist (SRS) met with other professionals and sometimes parents in their efforts to help the students. More than 500 students were served by this program during the '78-79 school year.

Evaluation Procedures

The primary concerns that are the focus of the evaluation design are (1) the impact of the program on the students it served and (2) the perceptions of those who are in a position to see how the program affects the students, i.e. teachers, principals and parents. Items were also incorporated in the teacher's and principal's survey instruments to solicit ideas on improving the program.

To measure impact on the students, a test to assess the students' self-concept, or how he viewed himself in his social context was administered at the beginning and at the termination of service. The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale was used for this purpose.

There is some concern that this test-and no test currently available-fully addresses itself to the total thrust of the program. Furthermore, a test of self-concept may actually show a decline as the student becomes more adjusted through counseling. It must also be recognized that if a student is in a miserable school or family environment, his self-concept may not be amenable to improvement by periodic counseling sessions.

In any event, self-concept should ideally show improvement as a primary or secondary benefit to the student and the Piers-Harris appeared to be the best instrument to make that assessment. Reliability and validity are well documented and acceptable.

Perceptions of classroom teachers making referrals was measured by adapting a questionnaire that was used the previous year for the same purpose. This questionnaire was sent to all teachers and principals who made referrals via the school district mail delivery system. Respondents were provided with self-addressed, franked envelopes so that they could complete the questionnaire and mail it to the evaluation consultants. All respondents remain anonymous.

Principals were sent a questionnaire that included all three components of the Title VII program. The SRS perceptions were included in that questionnaire. Those questionnaires were returned to the Title VII director, but respondents were anonymous unless-as a few did-they signed them.

Parents were mailed a survey instrument along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope that was addressed to the evaluation consultants. Parents were selected for receiving the questionnaire by taking every seventh parent as a suitable sample to represent the total parent population. Since the parents were surveyed through a mailed questionnaire and since it was done on a sampling basis, questionnaires were identified by a number that corresponded to the list of parents. Parents were called by phone if they did not return the questionnaire. At least two attempts to reach these parents were made.

Approximately ten of the phone numbers were no longer in service. Twenty-one parent questionnaires were eventually received of the 76 sent out for a 27.6% return.

Copies of all questionnaires are found in the Appendixes.

Test Results

Results of the Piers-Harris test were analyzed by the amount of time served by the program. An analysis of pretest-posttest average scores was made by a common t-test formula for similar groups since only those students were included on whom both pretest and posttest data were available. Table I shows the results of that analysis.

The comparisons clearly show that for students served four, five, six and seven months there were positive gains that equal or exceed acceptable levels of statistical significance. There is no apparent reason for the students who were in the program for eight months to fail to show significant increases as a group. Closer examination showed no systematic factors when results were examined by school, by teacher or by examiner. Thirteen of the forty students in that group showed declines, some quite severe, in test scores from the pretest to the posttest period. Furthermore, the thesis that the most serious cases would tend to be in the program longest does not appear to hold in view of the greatest significance of change being demonstrated by those in the program for seven months. We simply do not have the information that could account for this finding. Conceivably, the characteristics of those served eight months differ from the others in some way, or those of their referring teachers differ, or they experienced something different, or concentrated on something different. Each case would have to be profiled and the SRS who worked with the child interviewed in order to explain the pattern.

TABLE I

PIERS HARRIS PRETEST POST COMPARISONS
by number of months served

	Four months	Five months	Six months	Seven months	Eight months
Pretest Average	49	49	50	51	50
Posttest Average	54	54	56	56	52
Degrees of Freedom	100	84	112	92	78
T-Test value	4.55	2.04	4.90	7.68	.813
Significant at .05	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Significant at .01	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

Perceptions of Participating Professionals and Parents

Of the 277 teachers who made referrals 173 or 62.5% responded to the questionnaire. In view of the anonymity of the survey and in view of there being no direct incentive to respondents to react to the effort, particularly very near the end of the school year, this percentage of return is quite respectable.

Teachers were asked how many students they referred to the program this year. Confidence in the program by making multiple referrals is evident by the following table.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF REFERRALS MADE

	Number of Referrals						
Number making referrals	1 46	2 53	3 22	4 18	5 15	6 9	7 or more 6

Satisfaction is indicated by the perceived promptness of follow-up by the SRS staff after a referral was made. Also a comparison with last year's results shows some improvement in this area. When asked "How quick was the follow-up...?" the following distribution of responses was observed.

TABLE III

PROMPTNESS OF FOLLOW-UP

Year	Very	Fairly	Not Very	Varies
78-79	74%	20%	3%	3%
77-78	69	21	9	1

This corresponds with the principal's perceptions, for 91% reported "yes" to a question of whether the follow-ups were prompt and 9% reported "sometimes." This is almost identical to the principals' responses of the previous year when asked the same question.

A comparison with last year's reaction can also be made by observing the perceived assistance to the classroom teacher in working with the student. When asked "How productive has the SRS been in working with you to help your referred student?" the following percentages appear:

TABLE IV

PERCEIVED ASSISTANCE TO TEACHER IN WORKING WITH STUDENT

Year	Very	Fairly	Not Very	Can't say
78-79	45%	32%	18%	4%
77-78	39	40	14	5

Although the teachers show a slight positive increase in their view of the SRS's assistance to them, a similar question posed to the principals shows some unfavorable slippage. When asked if SRSers provided adequate feedback to teachers, last year 95% of the principals reported "yes" while only 74% said so this year.

An open-ended question asking how the SRS could be of greater help drew several responses-some strongly worded-from teachers that they would like more involvement in the program. Some of these felt that the SRS was too secretive in dealing with their students. This question and another open-ended question relating to program improvement brought out many comments that indicate communications between the teachers and the SRS staff could stand improvement.

Two items were included in the instrument to elicit perceptions of the desired amount of student-SRS contact. Recognizing that there are many factors to be considered in each individual case the items were prefaced by the qualifier "in general" to imply a broad frame of reference. The greatest percentage (52%) cited two times per week as desirable. In descending order of preference were three times (21%), once (19%) and daily 6%. The other question of that pair addressed the amount of time the SRS spends with each client while that student is out of the classroom. Forty one percent checked

"the right amount of time is spent," while 38% indicated too little time is spent, 20% indicated that the amount of time was not of concern to them and only 1% checked "too much time is spent."

In view of the usual reluctance of teachers to have individual students out of the classroom, these figures should be viewed as quite positive. Most interesting is that very few thought that the amount of time for the sessions was too long.

What did come out elsewhere in the teachers' surveys was a rather clear indication that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the scheduling or the lack of scheduling of the SRS staff. Although 74% of the teachers indicated that the schedule did synchronize with their classroom schedules, and 87% of the principals said that the visitation synchronized with the school's schedule, there were numerous unsolicited comments regarding the visitations. Some of these reports went into detail discussing how the students were disappointed when the appointment was not kept and how it was discouraging not to know if the SRS would or would not be there. Terms like "inconsistent", "rather hit and miss situation", "more punctual", and "did not show up", which are found scattered throughout the teachers questionnaire should be viewed quite seriously.

A strong indication of confidence in the SRS program is the large percentage (54%) that reported having recommended to other teachers that they refer some of their students to the program.

Perhaps the most significant summative question, and one that is related to recommending the program to other teachers, is the question "Overall how would you rate the SRS activity in helping students you have referred?" The general response was quite favorable as it was last year. The percentages

of responses are shown below:

TABLE V

OVERALL RATING OF SRS PROGRAM

Year	Extremely Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	Of No Help	Can't Say
78-79	40%	40%	15%	2%	2%
77-78	39	43	9	6	6

Apparently the strong base of support among the teachers holds firm.

Suggestions for improving the program were solicited from teachers and principals. In addition to those stated or implied earlier, some suggestions were made to involve parents to a greater extent, while others ranged from "drop the program" to "have a SRS in each building." Most, however, related to scheduling and communications. In fact about one-third of those who commented referred to the need for some more definitive schedule for the student-SRS contact.

As stated earlier, an attempt was made to see how parents viewed the program. Twenty one of the surveys were returned for a 27% return rate.

This poor rate of return is not a surprise for the first question provides some clue to the extent of involvement and knowledge of the program. Slightly over 55% of those reporting said they had never been visited by the SRS. Three of those reporting said that they were visited once, three reported twice and two reported three visits. Some of these visits were by phone as written notes on the questionnaire indicated. During the telephone follow-ups to those who did not send back the survey, it was observed that several parents were somewhat vague in their knowledge of the program.

Over half (53%) of those who did respond said they would like to have more contact with the SRS.

In view of the uncertainity just reported it should come as no surprise to learn that neutral responses were modal on the rest of the questions asked of the parents.

The parents who were familiar with the program provided strong support however. The opportunity to provide "other comments" was used by several of the parents to acknowledge-frequently in glowing terms-individuals who had worked with their child. Some were enthusiastic when called by phone in their endorsement of the program.

More specifically, five of the parents reported that they understood their child better as a result of the SRS program, three said they did not, and the rest couldn't say.

Seven reported their relationship with the child was better as a result of of the program; three saw no improvement and the remainder couldn't say.

Five of the parents cited the program as being "very beneficial" for their child, seven saw it as "of some benefit," none saw it "of little benefit', one saw it as of "no benefit" and six "couldn't say." Their views of the overall value of the SRS program were almost identical to the way they saw it as a benefit to their child.

Concluding Observations and Recommendations

This program has been incorporated into the elementary schools of the district with an enthusiastic welcome. There appears to be wide acceptance by principals, teachers, and parents who have been involved.

The impact of the program on the students' self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris is also impressive.

It is therefore readily apparent that the program should be continued and in view of the strong support for additional time and better scheduling, should be expanded.

This proposed expansion relates to the two primary concerns of the teachers and may alleviate those problems. Where a SRS must cover several buildings, he/she cannot schedule time precisely and the possibilities of encountering delays increase as the number of sites increase. Furthermore, as the number of cases a specialist must work with increases, he/she has no time to schedule being in the building for informal conferences or for being there just in case of emergencies.

If additional personnel were available, they could be assigned to buildings for larger blocks of time, thus allowing fewer chances of missing appointments, running late, or losing contact with teachers.

If, however, there are no additional personnel available, serious consideration should be given to scheduling the existing staff to specific buildings for larger blocks of time and holding rigidly to that schedule. This has some problems in that the number and severity of referrals does not necessarily coincide with that schedule since referrals cannot be predicted well in advance. However, it does have some promise in better relations with the building faculties.

In any event, every effort should be made to honor each appointment that is made.

Time should be made available for providing feedback to classroom teachers, so that this can be done in each feasible case. This will not permit the time of the SRS to be used as efficiently in terms of student contact, but since the teachers are a very essential aspect of the program, their cooperation is essential and most can be directly supportive of the student receiving SRS help.

While recognizing that time and other resources are limited, the enthusiastic support from the few parents who were involved and their interest in

further involvement raises the possibility of direct attempts to involve or at least inform parents through visitations. This may pay dividends in other areas of school-community relations beyond the immediate needs of the student in question. But fully developing this component of the program would be very time consuming and should not assume a higher priority in terms of budgeting time than providing direct assistance to the student.

By all means the thrust of the program as it is now going should be continued. There are many authorities who contend that this type of program should be a regular component in any elementary education program.

DIAGNOSTIC/PRESCRIPTIVE SPECIALISTS PROGRAM

Nature of the Program

The primary thrust of this program is to provide remedial assistance to elementary students who are not performing academic tasks adequately. A secondary aspect is to provide supplementary materials for accelerated students.

To conduct the program, a group of eight Diagnostic Prescriptive Specialists comprised the central staff of the project. Their responsibilities were to visit the schools to which they were assigned, evaluate the learning needs and styles of the students who had been referred in those schools, prescribe learning activities and materials for those students, and to work with the classroom teachers and aides in improving the academic performance of the referred student.

Aides were assigned to the elementary schools to provide individual and small group activities to the students as indicated in the prescription. Five of these twenty aides were assigned to two elementary schools.

Classroom teachers represented the initial phase of the process in that they were primarily responsible for identifying and referring students who could benefit from the services provided. In all, 148 teachers made referrals to the DPS staff for assistance. Approximately 500 students were served during the year.

Evaluation Procedures

To evaluate the program, two major concerns were addressed. One was to determine academic growth of the students and the other was to elicit the perceptions of those professionals who had a role in the program activities.

In view of the importance of reading and mathematics skills at the elementary level, and because these basic skills account for the deficiencies addressed in almost all remedial programs at that level, tests in one or both subjects were administered to referred students at the beginning of their involvement with the DPS program. These tests provided the benchmark against which to compare performance at the end of the student's involvement as well as valuable diagnostic information. As indicated, posttests on the same subject or subjects were administered to the students by the diagnostician upon termination from receiving the services. These tests were subsequently compared on a group basis to assess student growth.

For assessing reading skills in grades one and two, the reading recognition and reading comprehension subtests of the Peabody Individual Achievement Test were used. The Woodcock Reading Mastery Test was used to assess reading ability in grades three through six. Math skills were measured at all grade levels by Keymath.

Analyses were also done with these tests to determine if there appeared to be a significant relationship between improved performance and the number of days per week served. Analyses were also made of the relationships between the number of months served and improved performance.

Instruments to survey the perceptions of referring teachers, aides, and principals were developed and distributed via school district mail service to these participants. These were anonymous and, with the exception of the principals' questionnaire, to be sent to the outside evaluation team via a franked, self-addressed envelope which was attached to the questionnaire.

All data analyses and interpretations were done by the evaluation team from Sangamon State University.

Math Test Results

Results of the KeyMath pretest-posttest comparisons are shown in Table 1 for total comparisons by grade level.

TABLE I

KEYMATH TOTAL

		PRETEST		POSTTEST		GRADE EQUIVALENT CHANGE
GRADE	NUMBER	RAW	GRADE EQUIVALENT	RAW	GRADE EQUIVALENT	
1	19	35.15	1.0	51.94	1.7	+.7
2	13	55.84	1.8	72.53	2.4	+.6
3	13	76.00	2.5	101.53	3.3	+.8
4	18	103.80	3.4	127.20	4.2	+.8
5	19	120.10	3.9	141.40	4.8	+.9
6	17	133.23	4.4	152.41	5.4	+1.0

Of particular significance is the observation that the average scores of students upon entering the program are below grade level. This indicates that the students who are in the program are indeed in need of remediation. In all instances, grade equivalent changes were positive, and in grades 2, 3, and 4, posttests indicated that these students were above grade level upon completion of the program. Grades 5 and 6 did not achieve grade level proficiency, in spite of the largest grade level gains, for they were further below grade level when pretested.

Clearly the effects of the program are largely responsible for these gains. Without such intervention, students typically fall further behind as they progress through school rather than overcome deficiencies, as

indicated by the increased disparity between grade equivalents and grade enrolled (comparing column 1 and column 4 of Table I).

Of further concern was the relative impact of days per week served by the program. Table II compares grade equivalent changes by grade by number of days served. The size of the subsets was not adequate for statistical analysis by grade and the totals showed no statistically significant difference when examined by Chi square analysis.

TABLE II

KEYMATH GRADE EQUIVALENT CHANGE BY NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK SERVED
(All change is positive)

GRADE	One Day	Two Days	Three Days	Four Days	Five Days
1	.5 (3)	.6 (4)	.9 (4)	.6 (7)	1.3 (1)
2	.5 (1)	.5 (3)	.6 (5)	1.0 (1)	.4 (3)
3	(0)	.6 (5)	1.1 (6)	(0)	.4 (2)
4	(0)	.8 (2)	.7 (10)	1.0 (3)	.9 (3)
5	(0)	1.2 (5)	.9 (6)	.7 (2)	.7 (6)
6	(0)	1.1 (9)	(0)	(0)	.9 (8)
AVERAGE	.5 (4)	.87 (28)	.82 (31)	.73 (13)	.75 (23)

(Numbers in parenthesis represents number of students in that category.)

Before one can conclude, however, that the number of days that the student received assistance had no impact, we should examine the relative deficiencies at the onset of remediation to see if by grade level there was greater attention given to those who were least amenable to positive change. One can assume this was the case, although further analysis with larger numbers would be necessary to establish this contention with any degree of certainty

The same rationale holds when examining the relationship between grade equivalent gains and number of months spent in the program. Table III shows this relationship.

TABLE III

KEYMATH GRADE EQUIVALENT CHANGE BY NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED
(All change is positive)

Grade	One Mo.	Two Mo.	Three Mos.	Four Mos.	Five Mos.	Six Mos.	Seven Mos.	Eight Mos.
1	(0)	(0)	.6 (5)	.3 (2)	.6 (9)	.7 (1)	(0)	1.4 (2)
2	(0)	.4 (1)	.4 (1)	.8 (3)	(0)	.4 (6)	(0)	.7 (2)
3	(0)	(0)	1.0 (2)	.6 (3)	1.2 (2)	.7 (3)	.8 (3)	(0)
4	(0)	(0)	.6 (1)	.9 (4)	.7 (1)	.8 (9)	.9 (3)	(0)
5	1.1 (1)	(0)	1.0 (1)	1.0 (3)	1.1 (8)	.7 (5)	1.1 (1)	(0)
6	(0)	(0)	.1 (3)	1.4 (3)	.8 (4)	1.1 (6)	(0)	(0)
AVERAGE	1.1 (1)	.4 (1)	.5 (13)	.8 (18)	.7 (24)	.5 (30)	.8 (7)	1.0 (4)

(Numbers in parenthesis represents number of students in that category)

DPS-5

Again, the numbers are too small in the subsets for analysis and there is no significant difference when the totals are compared. If nothing else, this may indicate strongly that teachers refer those first who are least amenable to remediation.

Reading Test Results

Two subtests of the Peabody Individual Achievement Test were used for pretesting and posttesting students in grades one and two. These were reading recognition and reading comprehension.

Normative information on the PIAT was not as finely calibrated as on the KeyMath, thus precluding finer analysis by grade equivalent. Table IV displays the total scores of pretests, posttests and the norms for the corresponding grades.

TABLE IV

PEABODY INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST TOTALS

	Reading Recognition				Reading Comprehension			
Grade	Number	Pretest	Posttest	Norm	Number	Pretest	Posttest	Norm
1	67	15.22	21.5	21.0	32	16.56	20.58	19.7
2	22	22.84	27.81	28.7	22	22.52	27.45	27.5

Analysis of the table shows that in grade one the average pretest scores are below grade level while the average posttest scores are above the grade level equivalent. While the second grade averages on the posttest are still below the norm, the pretest scores are considerably below grade level, thus indicating marked gains.

Tables V and VI display average pretest and posttest scores broken down by months served.

TABLE V

GRADE 1

PEABODY INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST BY TIME SERVED

Months Served	Reading Recognition			Reading Comprehension		
	Number	Pretest	Posttest	Number	Pretest	Posttest
3	7	18.5	23.0	4	19.0	22.0
4	8	12.8	17.78	1	17.0	20.0
5	19	15.15	21.47	8	16.25	19.13
6	16	14.43	21.68	7	14.57	20.71
7	14	16.92	23.78	10	16.9	21.3
8	2	12.5	17.0	1	17.0	19.0
		NORM = 21.0			NORM = 19.7	

(Numbers of students tested may not correspond with totals where months served and/or days served were not available.)

TABLE VI

GRADE 2

PEABODY INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST BY TIME SERVED

Months Served	Reading Recognition			Reading Comprehension		
	Number	Pretest	Posttest	Number	Pretest	Posttest
3	3	18.6	24.6	1	19.0	25.0
4	3	29.6	31.33	3	24.3	32.66
5	3	23.0	29.6	3	22.3	26.0
6	11	22.5	26.6	5	22.6	28.2
7	0	--	--	0	--	--
8	2	21.0	28.5	2	21.0	26.5
		NORM = 28.7			NORM = 27.5	

While insufficient information is available to do more detailed analysis, inspection of the tables shows a consistent increase in the students' scores from pretest to posttest.

Tables VII and VIII, showing the various scores by number of days served, also show consistent improvement.

TABLE VII

GRADE 1

PEABODY INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST
BY NUMBER OF DAYS SERVED

Days	Reading Recognition			Reading Comprehension		
Served	Number	Pretest	Posttest	Number	Pretest	Posttest
1	4	18.75	22.5	3	19.0	20.0
2	16	17.75	23.5	8	18.7	20.85
3	18	15.35	20.4	10	16.5	20.5
4	9	11.7	16.2	1	19.0	20.0
5	20	14.0	23.2	10	14.0	20.7
		NORM =	21.0		NORM =	19.7

TABLE VIII

GRADE 2

PEABODY INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST
BY NUMBER OF DAYS SERVED

Days	Reading Recognition			Reading Comprehension		
Served	Number	Pretest	Posttest	Number	Pretest	Posttest
1	1	29.0	30.0	1	24.0	28.0
2	10	24.1	29.1	10	22.22	29.44
3	6	22.5	26.83	2	24.50	27.0
4	0	--	--	0	--	--
5	5	19.8	25.8	2	20.50	24.0
		NORM =	28.7		NORM =	27.5

The caveat for conclusions about the lack of demonstrable effect of the various time frames should be kept in mind while viewing the tabled values.

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Test was used to assess reading abilities of students in grades three through six. Table IX reports total pretest and posttest scores by grade level.

TABLE IX

WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST COMPARISONS

		PRETEST		POSTTEST		
Grade	Number	Raw Score	Grade Equivalent	Raw Score	Grade Equivalent	Grade Equivalent Change
3	15	439.6	2.0	497.5	2.5	+.5
4	23	607.3	3.7	627.0	4.0	+.3
5	18	549.16	3.0	586.55	3.4	+.3
6	14	598.57	3.6	634.07	4.1	+.5

This table shows that the average grade equivalent for all four grades improved. All averages were below grade level on both the pretest and the posttest with the exception of the fourth grade posttest. No conclusions can be drawn relating to relative deficiencies and amount of grade equivalent gain.

Table X shows grade equivalent gains in relation to number of months served by the program.

TABLE X

WOODCOCK READING TEST GRADE EQUIVALENT CHANGE BY TIME IN PROGRAM

Grade	Two Mos.	Three Mos.	Four Mos.	Five Mos.	Six Mos.	Seven Mos.	Eight Mos.
3	(0)	(0)	.1 (2)	.4 (5)	.8 (4)	.3 (4)	(0)
4	(0)	.4 (2)	.8 (9)	.6 (5)	.1 (2)	.6 (5)	(0)
5	-.4 (1)	(0)	.8 (6)	1.1 (3)	.3 (2)	.1 (2)	1.1 (4)
6	.7 (1)	(0)	.9 (5)	1.1 (1)	.6 (7)	(0)	(0)
AVERAGE	.3 (2)	.4 (2)	.8 (22)	.7 (14)	.5 (17)	.4 (11)	1.1 (4)

(Number in parenthesis represents numbers of students in that category)

Unfortunately, as was the case in the previous table the numbers are insufficient for more detailed analysis. Careful study of the table fails to show any consistent relationship between time spent in the program and grade equivalent gain. This is probably, as mentioned earlier, the result of referring and treating those first who were least amenable to remediation.

Table XI shows grade equivalent changes as they relate to number of days per week served by the program. Once again a relationship is not observable.

TABLE XI

WOODCOCK READING TEST GRADE EQUIVALENT CHANGE
BY Number of Days Per Week Served

Grade	One Day	Two Days	Three Days	Four Days	Five Days
3	0 (1)	.2 (3)	.7 (4)	.1 (2)	.8 (5)
4	.4 (1)	.8 (3)	.6 (9)	.6 (4)	.6 (6)
5	(0)	.9 (4)	.1 (2)	-.4 (7)	1.5 (5)
6	(0)	.9 (4)	.4 (2)	.8 (1)	.7 (7)
AVERAGE	.4 (1)	.7 (14)	.4 (17)	0 (14)	.8 (23)

(Numbers in parenthesis represent the number of students in that category)

Perceptions of Participants

The classroom teacher is, perhaps, in the best position to make professional judgements about the effect of the program on students he/she may have referred for assistance. Accordingly, a survey instrument to elicit their perceptions was sent to them to which they responded anonymously. Of the 148 questionnaires sent out, 102 or 70%

were returned. A copy of the questionnaire is in the Appendix.

The overall impressions of the teachers were very positive. In some instances comparisons can be made with similar items that, were asked in the Title VII Evaluation questionnaire of one year ago. For example, responses to the question, "How accurate do you feel the diagnosis of your student's learning problems was?" can be compared:

TABLE XII

PERCEIVED ACCURACY OF DIAGNOSES

Year	Very	Fairly	Not Very	Can't say
78-79	67%	22%	7%	3%
77-78	44%	44%	5%	6%

The question, "How appropriate were the prescribed programs for the students' needs?" was also asked both years:

TABLE XII

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF PRESCRIPTIONS

Year	Very	Fairly	Not very	Can't say
78-79	76%	16.5%	4.8%	4.8%
77-78	46%	37.0%	9.0%	8.0%

Very clearly the classroom teachers view the accuracy of the diagnosis and the appropriateness of the programs with much more favor than in the first year of the program.

Principals also responded very favorably to how their teachers viewed the prescriptions. Seventeen of the 25 responding principals, or 74 percent, indicated that their teachers considered the prescriptions "usually" appropriate; 22 percent felt that their teachers considered them "sometimes" appropriate; and one, or 4% reported the teachers perceived them as "seldom" appropriate. Furthermore, 91% reported that their teachers were generally supportive of the program; one, or 4% said they were not; and one couldn't say.

Teachers were also asked if the aide's schedule was compatible with their classroom schedule. Ninety-four per cent reported "yes". Those who reported difficulties indicated concern with the fact that the students missed the same subject each time they were out of the room, and some suggested the aide should be scheduled so that this would not occur.

A comparison with the previous year can also be made in terms of the perceived adequacy of time spent with each case. The frequency of spending enough time is shown:

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY OF SPENDING ADEQUATE TIME WITH EACH CASE

Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
78-79	36%	55%	7%	3%	.9%
77-78	19%	52%	19%		9%

Although the scaling is not exactly the same for both years ("seldom" was not an option in 77-78), there is overwhelming positive change in the eyes of the referring teachers.

There is very little feedback from parents on their childrens' involvement in the DPS program. Only 1% of teachers indicated that they usually received feedback, 9% reported "sometimes" to the question, 44.5% cited "seldom", and 46% said "never" when asked of the extent of parental feedback.

Of those reporting feedback 22% viewed it as "very positive", 37% as "somewhat positive", 32% as "mixed", 4.8% as "somewhat negative" and 4.8% as "very negative". There were no reports of violence during the "very negative" feedback sessions, however.

When given a list of possible inservice topics that could be provided by the DPS staff, and asked to rank order the three in which there was the greatest interest, the following number of respondents indicated those choices.

TABLE XV

INSERVICE TRAINING PREFERENCE

	First Preference	Second Preference	Third Preference
Sequencing Learning Activities	1	38	31
Developing and Utilizing Learning Stations	9	17	19
Developing Learning Games	5	13	18
Identification of Learning Difficulties	58	12	2
Parental Involvement in Teaching/ Learning	14	20	19
Other	2	3	2

The clear preference for identification of learning difficulties may not be the primary perceived need of the responding teachers; it may well be that the teachers view this as a means of contributing to the DPS program. If so, it repeats the strong endorsements of the program indicated elsewhere in the analysis.

Teachers rely heavily on the aides to work with referred students. Forty percent indicated they relied "to a great extent", and 45% indicated "to some extent" while only 7% reported "very little" and 6% said "not at all". Teachers were asked to indicate what they felt the primary responsibility of the aide to be. Overwhelmingly they reported responsibilities that are correctly identified with the role as described by the DPS program.

This is confirmed by the aides when asked if they thought their roles and responsibilities were understood by the teachers. Eighty-two per cent reported yes as compared with 66% for the previous year. Ninety-four per cent

reported that the principals understood their roles and responsibilities as compared with an 80% positive response from the previous year.

When asked to cite obstacles to greater utilization of the aides, more teachers (28) mentioned time than any other factor. Scheduling was mentioned by eight teachers.

Recommendations for improving the program also clearly illustrated confidence in the aides, for the most frequently mentioned improvement was the addition of more aides.

Other program improvement suggestions included more teacher/aide communication, expand the program, allow more DPS time in each building, add more materials for the gifted, more frequent monitoring of student progress, involve parents, speed up the arrival of packets, improve the diagnostic tests, include more specialists in the DPS program, organize the DPS staff for specialization and keep the aides from being diverted by other assignments.

In short, the teachers were overwhelmingly supportive of the program. Only two of the returned questionnaires reflected overt hostility.

As indicated above the aides major responsibility is to work with students who are experiencing learning difficulties. Of the 20 questionnaires sent to aides, 17 were returned, and all indicated that this was where they spent most of their time. The average amount of time per week spent this way was 21.6 hours. The next greatest expenditure of time was in supervising lunch and playground. This consumed 3.3 hours while school bus monitoring took 2.7 hours per week.

All aides felt responsible to the principal and/or the Title VII staff. This and previously mentioned indicators of roles and responsibilities imply significant improvement over last year when there was some

confusion in this area.

Aides also indicate some pride in what they are doing. Most (94%) would like to exchange ideas with their peers and 62.5% say they have job experiences that might be beneficial to their peers.

The greatest inservice need of aides appears to be increased knowledge about how students learn, and how to utilize the materials that are available to them.

Time and working location were the biggest problems facing aides in their jobs. Other problems cited were lack of teacher and principal's support, nonrelated assignments, unmotivated students, and lack of interaction among aides. Several suggested better communication as the best way of improving the program.

Building principals are in strategic positions to view the DPS program as it provides services to their schools. Of the twenty-three principals reporting, all said they had "much" or "some" involvement with the program.

When asked how well the program was coordinated with other activities to help with learning problems, 56.5% reported "very well" while 39% indicated "somewhat" and 4% (one principal) reported "little or none".

Ninety-one per cent said that their teachers were generally supportive of the program while 4% indicated that the teachers were not and 4% couldn't say. In a similar vein, 87% said that their teachers and the DPS staff worked well together and 13% said they worked well together sometimes.

The principals also reported prompt followup of referred students. The number compared with the previous years responses are noteworthy in their observations when asked if the followup was prompt;

TABLE XVI

PERCEIVED PROMPTNESS OF FOLLOWUP

Year	Yes	Sometimes	No	Can't say
78-79	16	7	0	0
77-78	7	9	3	1

Again this year, principals would like to see the DPS staff spend more time in their buildings. Seventy-eight per cent indicated more time as desirable and 22% couldn't say.

Recommendations to improve the program brought a few suggestions from principals. Among these suggestions were faster packet development, clearer understanding of the relationships with the DPS staff, more clerical help for the DPS staff, more full-time aides, more flexibility of services provided by the DPS staff and more direct help given to students by the staff.

Concluding Observations and Recommendations

The DPS program has developed a strong base of support from teachers, principals and aides. The base of support is much stronger this year than last. It is apparent that the program (1) has improved in terms of meeting the expectations of others, (2) is much better organized than last year, (3) is demonstrating the capability of providing better services, (4) is better understood by the teachers and principals, and (5) is greatly reducing learning deficiencies.

In view of this marked improvement and strong endorsements, few recommendations are obvious. Program expansion, in terms of providing additional services to more students by adding aides and diagnosticians appears to be desirable.

Continued efforts to explain the program to classroom teachers is also desirable. It would be desirable to see more teachers, if not all teachers, making referrals to the program.

Parental involvement is rather time consuming, but if time and resources permit, may well be worth adding to the program.

MULTI-CULTURAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Nature of the Program

The Multi-Cultural Staff Development Center is a rather unique in-service program that provides elementary teachers with the resources to develop special instructional units aimed at increasing their students' awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences. The format is a voluntary four-day workshop. Classroom teachers, having acclimated their substitute on Monday, spend Tuesday through Friday at the Center guided by a teacher specialist. This concentrated period of time is devoted to reviewing the Center's collection of multi-media materials on the way of life of a variety of cultures and putting together a unit of instruction on a topic the teacher has selected.

A model unit is presented to the teachers on the first day. While they receive assistance and suggestions right along throughout the week, teachers have wide individual discretion in choosing the content, format, learning aids, and so on, for their unit. On the fourth day in the Center, teachers present their unit to the teaching specialist and the other participants for practice and feedback.

The Center staff reproduce the unit, make a copy available to the teacher for use in the classroom, then catalog it for use throughout the District. Within six weeks, the teaching specialist makes a follow-up visit to each of the participants to observe the unit in progress and to provide further ideas and support.

Evaluation Procedures

This year the evaluation of the Multi-Cultural Center (MCC) set out to do two things: to collect summary ratings by participating teachers and their principals of various features of the program and suggestions for improving it; and to measure change as a result of the program in participants'

level of awareness of and sensitivity to other cultures. Two different instruments were used.

The Rating Form

Last year's rating form was used basically intact again this year to permit comparison of participants' perceptions of the program. Some new questions were added to reflect new components of the program and to poll teachers' interest in attending workshops after school hours and in receiving official acknowledgment of professional development. One other modification of last year's questionnaire was that the wording of the "anchor" points of some of the response scales was changed somewhat to reduce their extremity. The scales are still comparable however. The questionnaire is reproduced in the Appendix.

A copy of the questionnaire was sent to all teachers who attended the Center during the '78-79 school year. The school district mail system was used for this purpose. Accompanying each questionnaire was a pre-addressed, franked envelope for return mailing to the evaluation consultants. All respondents remain anonymous.

As mentioned in previous sections of the report, principals were sent a comprehensive questionnaire which included questions about the MCC program. Those questionnaires were returned to the Title VII director but respondents were not to identify themselves.

The Cultural Awareness Scale

In the application for second-year Title VII funding, it was hypothesized that participants in the MCC activities would demonstrate a statistically significant increase from pretest to posttest in cultural awareness. In devising an instrument to be used in testing this hypothesis, the approach the evaluation team took was to view "cultural awareness" conceptually as orientation toward cultural differences. Orientation was chosen as a broad

sociological concept which includes attitudes, feelings, awareness and sensitivity.

Further, since the particular culture on which a unit was developed would differ from participant to participant, and, though there are a number of Asian children and children of other minorities in the District, Blacks make up the largest single racial or cultural minority in Springfield, the content of the items, it was decided, would focus primarily on relations between Blacks and whites in the context of education, schools and integration. In the conscious decision not to address other minorities in the instrument, the evaluation team made two assumptions: that, after all, the real issues connected with desegregation grow out of those relations (between Blacks and whites) and one's orientation toward cultural differences is generalizable in the main from one culture to another.

The process of constructing the instrument itself was a more time-consuming and painstaking task than was originally envisioned. The classic ethnocentrism scales, it turned out, contained too many dated items and played too strongly to extreme affective dimensions of attitudes toward other ethnic groups to be of utility as a source of items for the purpose at hand. Even the classic social distance scales, which are not so obsolete and continue to be adapted and to appear in the sociological literature from time to time, provided little real help in formulating items that would tap into attitudes about the relation of education to the social environment.

However, the sociological and educational research literature did provide the kernels for some of the items. By and large, though, the pool of items from which the final ones were chosen was generated through discussions with the MCC Director and faculty colleagues of the evaluators. The subject matter,

the nature of the program and the characteristics of the participants pretty much dictated that this more informal, iterative process of identifying items be used in designing the instrument.

Some forty items were developed in this fashion. A draft of the instrument was reviewed by a sociologist, a political scientist and a specialist in Education and training, all with familiarity with the literature and similar instruments in this field. Guided by their comments, a critical set of twenty-eight items was selected and then field tested with a group made up primarily of educators. Results of the field test indicated the wording of items was sufficiently simple and straightforward and that the six-point response scale, without a neutral position (in order to force opinion), was not troublesome to respondents. The final version of the instrument was previewed by the MCC Director. It is reproduced on pages 9-13 of this section.

The attitude scale was administered twice, as a "pre-test," then as a "post-test." Starting the first week of March, participants were asked to complete it at the beginning of their first day in the Center, with the printed instructions supplemented by a word from the teaching specialist about how it would be processed so as to ensure anonymity. In May, a second copy of the instrument was sent to participants, most of whom had taught their unit by then. A comparison could then be made between participants' orientations before the program and after.

In addition to looking at the extent attitudes had changed, the evaluation was interested in the direction they had changed. As with any opinion scale, there were no right or wrong answers, strictly speaking. Roughly speaking, however, attitudes can be considered positive or negative and attitude change can be assessed as movement in a more positive or more negative direction.

For a variety of reasons, including the perceptual rather than factual basis on which one would respond to the items, the evaluators elected not to judge

themselves what was a positive and what a negative response to any given item. Instead, the modal response of a panel of judges was used to define a benchmark for each item against which participants' responses could be compared.

Ten persons, mostly educators, served as the panel of judges by completing the instrument. They in particular were approached because they were familiar with the Springfield Public Schools and have been close to or involved in the desegregation developments that have occurred in Springfield. As a result, they are in a position of recognizing the in-service needs teachers and others may have to carry out the spirit or intent of desegregation. Many participated in the inter-racial institutes conducted by Sangamon State University in previous years. The composition of the panel was almost a half and half balance between Blacks and whites.

Results of the Cultural Awareness Scale

A total of twenty-eight teachers completed the Cultural Awareness Scale at the Center before beginning the program. (Fifty teachers in all attended the Multi-Cultural Center this year but pre-test data were collected only from those entering the program from March on due to the delay in developing the instrument as discussed earlier.) Twenty-six of fifty teachers who were sent a follow-up copy of the Scale completed and returned it after the program ended.

It should be pointed out that pre-tests and post-tests could not be matched by individual respondent. Respondents were asked not to sign their name and the evaluators chose not to mark the instruments so as to identify respondents. A few demographic items were included at the end of the instrument but served only a descriptive purpose (of benefit to the evaluators) since not all those who completed the post-test had an opportunity to take the pre-test while some who had taken the pre-test assumed, when they received a second copy

in May, that it was a duplicate sent in error. For purposes of analysis, therefore, the data were grouped and the pre-test responses as a group were compared to the post-test responses as a group. The data are presented on pages 9-13 of this section.

In analyzing the data, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test (see note on next page) was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the distribution of responses to each item between the pre-test sample and the post-test sample. In the case of only one item did the responses change significantly from pre-test to post-test. That item, interestingly enough, was the statement, "Race and ethnic relations in Springfield are better today than they were prior to desegregation." As seen in Table I, under half (47.8%) agreed at least in part with the statement before the program while ninety percent of those responding after the program agreed at least in part. This was the last item of the Scale and was designed as a summative, closure item that would capture respondents' overall evaluative sense of the impact of Title VII.

This change in perceptions can be attributed to a broader perspective from which they viewed the overall impact of desegregation. A district-wide, community-wide perspective, engendered by participation in the MCC program, would allow teachers to evaluate desegregation in ways that were more detached and objective, unencumbered by any school or classroom problems that might have come about as a result of desegregation.

As described earlier, the modal (most frequently cited) response given by a panel of judges was used as a benchmark in assessing the direction of changes that occurred in respondents' views from pretest to posttest. Even though in all but one case the magnitude of change was not statistically significant, for all but six items where there was a stand off, so to speak, some slight change in the distribution of responses did occur.

TABLE I

CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO ITEM #28:

"Race and ethnic relations in Springfield are better today than they were prior to desegregation."

	Strongly agree		Agree		Agree* in part		Disagree in part		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	f%	cf%	f%	cf%	f%	cf%	f%	cf%	f%	cf%	f%	cf%
Pre (N=23)	0.0	0.0	17.4	17.4	30.4	47.8	21.7	69.6	26.0	95.7	4.3	100.0
Post (N=20)	5.0	5.0	20.0	25.0	65.0	90.0	5.0	95.0	0.0	95.0	5.0	100.0

K_D = .422 (significant at .05 level)

*interval containing the largest difference

- -

Note: The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test is a relatively powerful nonparametric statistic that can be used with small samples. It involves taking the cumulative frequency distribution for the two samples you wish to compare (in this case, the responses to a given item on the pre-test comprised one sample of values and the responses to that same item on the post-test comprised the second sample of values), identifying the interval, i.e. the response category, in which the largest difference exists, calculating the value of D (the difference) and comparing the calculated value to a tabled value for the level of significance (typically .05) one has chosen. If the observed or calculated value of D is equal to or greater than the tabled value, one can conclude there is a significant difference between the two samples. See: Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956, pp. 127-130.

However not much can be concluded from the change. There was movement in the direction indicated by the judges to be positive in the case of eleven items and movement in the direction indicated by the judges to be negative in the case of eleven other items. These differences were the result of chance variation, in the view of the evaluators.

At the same time, in examining the frequency percentages of the responses to the pre-test, one sees that, in general, there was a fair degree of congruence to begin with between the pre-test responses and the modal responses of the judges. This, together with the fact that cultural awareness, as measured by our scale, did not increase significantly from pre- to post-test, suggests the question, Are the teachers who choose to attend the Multi-Cultural Center already sensitive to other cultures? If so, if these teachers are "right-minded" to begin with, then change in their attitudes should not be expected. The question, Is the Multi-Cultural Center attracting and getting the teachers who really need its staff development program? seems to the evaluators to be the critical question.

As an end note, it must be said that the program actually is not designed in intensity or duration to change attitudes. In developing and teaching their unit on another culture, in the environment and with the resources the Center provides, presumably a teacher does become sensitized to that culture. However, to expect that experience alone, and the time spent, to produce significant change in more generalized orientations is probably unrealistic.

MULTI-CULTURAL CENTER SURVEY

Instructions

This brief questionnaire contains a number of statements about which there is no general agreement. Teachers, like others, differ widely in the way they feel about social and cultural issues. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. The purpose of the survey is to see how different teachers attending the Multi-Cultural Center feel about each item before and after their week's experience.

For each statement, please place a checkmark in the blank below the response choice that best describes how you honestly feel.

Do not sign your name. We appreciate your cooperation.

1. Blacks are now getting preferential treatment in Springfield schools.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree**	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	10.7%	35.7%	10.7%	35.7%	7.1%
Post	4%	24.0%	40.0%	4.0%	24.0%	4.0%

2. The role of the modern school is to facilitate cultural diffusion.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part**	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	33.3%	37%	7%	14.8%	7%
Post	8%	40.0%	36%	12%	4.0%	0%

3. Desegregated education can help bring about integration within society.

	strongly agree**	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	3.5%	46.4%	42.8%	3.5%	3.5%	0%
Post	12.0%	32.0%	44.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4%

4. Education will be less successful in effecting integration unless blacks also gain access to the economic mainstream.

	strongly agree	agree**	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	10.7%	60.7%	17.8%	7.1%	3.5%	0%
Post	20.0%	40.0%	24.0%	16.0%	0.0%	0%

5. So long as blacks and whites live in separate neighborhoods, education can't solve the integration problem.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part**	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	11.1%	33.3%	40.7%	11.1%	3.7%	3.7%
Post	20.0%	28.0%	48.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%

** Indicates modal response of the panel of judges.

6. It's a fact that most blacks really don't prefer desegregated schools.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree **	strongly disagree
Pre	0.0%	23%	23.0%	23.0%	26.9%	3.8%
Post	4.7%	19%	23.8%	28.5%	14.3%	9.5%

7. Desegregation has lowered the overall academic standards of schools in this district.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree **
Pre	0%	7.1%	7.1%	21.4%	46.4%	17.8%
Post	0%	17.3%	34.7%	4.3%	30.4%	13.0%

8. Concern with desegregation tends to confuse the priorities of a school district.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part **	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	7.1%	17.8%	32.1%	7.1%	32.1%	3.1%
Post	8.3%	12.5%	41.6%	16.6%	12.5%	8.3%

9. Desegregation has increased awareness of cultural differences.

	strongly agree	agree **	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	39.2%	42.8%	3.5%	10.7%	3.5%
Post	8%	48.0%	32.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%

10. Schools have a major responsibility for fostering understanding of other cultures.

	strongly agree **	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	17.8%	50%	25	3.5%	3.5%	0%
Post	28.0%	56%	16	0.0%	0.0%	0%

11. Schools should help break down ethnic stereotypes.

	strongly agree **	agree **	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	25%	53.5%	21.4%	0%	0%	0%
Post	28%	52.0%	12.0%	8%	0%	0%

12. Schools can't guarantee minority children equal access to educational opportunities.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree **	strongly disagree
Pre	3.5%	7.1%	21.4%	17.8%	28.6%	21.4%
Post	0.0%	7.7%	23.0%	19.2%	30.7%	19.2%

13. A student's economic background is a greater predictor of academic achievement than is ethnic background.

	strongly agree	agree**	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	14.3%	17.8%	35.7%	10.7%	17.8%	3.5%
Post	4.1%	33.3%	29.1%	16.6%	16.6%	0.0%

14. Given two students of almost equal ability, one black, one white, the white one should be given preferential treatment because his/her chances for success are greater.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree**
Pre	0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	21.4%	75%
Post	0%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%	20.8%	75%

15. Greater awareness of the differences among cultures leads to greater conflict between them.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree**	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	0%	7.1%	3.5%	67.8%	21.4%
Post	0%	0%	4.0%	12.0%	60.0%	24.0%

16. American society would be better off if cultural differences were de-emphasized.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree**	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	3.5%	14.3%	25%	35.7%	21.4%
Post	0%	8.3%	20.8%	25%	33.3%	12.5%

17. Curricular materials should emphasize cultural similarities rather than cultural differences.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part**	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	3.7%	18.5%	40.7%	18.5%	18.5%	0.0%
Post	4.3%	26.0%	30.4%	13.0%	21.7%	4.3%

18. Cultural differences are not great enough to justify special curricular materials.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree**	strongly disagree
Pre	3.5%	7.1%	17.8%	14.3%	53.5%	3.5%
Post	0.0%	8.0%	16.0%	32.0%	40.0%	4.0%

19. Before attention is given to cultural awareness studies, students should learn the basics: reading, writing and math.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part**	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	10.7%	17.8%	10.7%	21.4%	32.1%	7.1%
Post	8.0%	32.0%	20.0%	20.0%	12.0%	8.0%

20. Human awareness ought to be incorporated into all subject areas.

	strongly agree	agree**	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	17.8%	64.2%	14.3%	0%	3.5%	0%
Post	40.0%	40.0%	12.0%	8%	0.0%	0%

21. Teaching methods are equally effective for students from all cultural backgrounds.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree**	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	11.1%	11.1%	25.9%	44.4%	7.4%
Post	0%	25.0%	20.8%	12.5%	37.5%	4.1%

22. Children from different social strata reflect different learning styles.

	strongly agree	agree**	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	3.5%	53.5%	35.7%	3.5%	3.5%	0%
Post	0.0%	50.0%	29.1%	12.5%	8.3%	0%

23. A child's first language should be relied on extensively in school.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part**	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	0.0%	11.1%	25.9%	29.6%	22.2%	11.1%
Post	4.1%	8.3%	20.8%	29.1%	29.1%	8.3%

24. Minority children are often erroneously referred for remedial diagnosis.

	strongly agree**	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	3.7%	25.9%	25.9%	14.8%	25.9%	3.7%
Post	9.0%	13.6%	18.1%	22.7%	22.7%	13.6%

25. Treating all children fairly in the classroom has as much to do with integration as does busing.

	strongly agree**	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	51.8%	37%	7.4%	0%	3.7%	0%
Post	36.0%	52%	8.0%	4%	0.0%	0%

26. In general, white children are more upset about being bused to school than are black children.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part	disagree in part	disagree**	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	4.1%	20.8%	25%	37.5%	11.1%
Post	0%	20.0%	5.0%	10%	55.0%	10.0%

27. One myth about busing is that it weakens most children's self-esteem.

	strongly agree	agree	agree in part **	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	7.6%	15.3%	15.3%	11.5%	38.4%	11.5%
Post	9.5%	14.3%	9.5%	4.7%	57.1%	4.7%

28. Race and ethnic relations in Springfield are better today than they were prior to desegregation.

	strongly agree	agree **	agree in part **	disagree in part	disagree	strongly disagree
Pre	0%	17.4%	30.4%	21.7%	26%	4.3%
Post	5%	20.0%	65.0%	5.0%	0%	5.0%

The following questions will be used for statistical purposes only.

29. What is your age? _____

30. What is your sex? _____ Male _____ Female

31. In what field did you get your degree? _____

32. At what school do you teach? _____

33. What grade(s) do you teach? _____

34. How many years of teaching experience do you have? _____

35. How would you identify your ethnic group or racial background?

_____ White
_____ Black
_____ Hispanic
_____ American Indian
_____ Asian or Pacific Islander
_____ Other: _____
(Please specify)

Perceptions of Participants

As indicated before, questionnaires were sent to the fifty teachers who were served by the MCC, and the principals' questionnaires contained a section relating to the Center for principals whose teachers participated. Thirty-seven of the teachers responded and 15 of the 25 returned questionnaires had the section on the Center completed.

These questions provide insights into how the Center is viewed and suggestions for improving the operations of the Center.

One of the key concerns is the adequacy and appropriateness of the materials that teachers had available since all were concerned with developing a curricular unit. Teachers responded to a rating scale which showed a general level of satisfaction with the materials as reported in the following table. A comparison with the previous year is also made.

TABLE I

ADEQUACY OF MATERIALS

78-79	Very adequate	47%	33.0%	14.0%	3.0%	3.0% Very inadequate
77-78	Very adequate	35%	24.5%	24.5%	14.0%	2.0% Very inadequate

Although the year-to-year comparison shows general satisfaction for both years, there is a substantial shift from the first year to the second. This could well be the result of increased listings in the available resources.

When appropriateness of materials was rated, similar results are evident although the perceived improvement is not as dramatic.

TABLE II

APPROPRIATENESS OF MATERIALS

78-79	Very appropriate	49%	37%	9%	3%	3% Very Inappropriate
77-78	Very appropriate	52%	33%	28%	13%	0% Very Inappropriate

Satisfaction with the materials available was clearly surpassed by the reported ratings of staff assistance that was available at the Center. The following table reflects great satisfaction and an improvement over the previous year.

TABLE IV

RATINGS OF STAFF ASSISTANCE

78-79	Very sufficient	70%	16%	8%	3%	3%	Very insufficient
77-78	Very sufficient	54%	33%	12%	0%	0%	Very insufficient

This very positive change is commendable and may relate to the certainty of expectations of the participants for there is a parallel between these factors for the two years. In the 78-79 school year 76% of the participants reported that their expectations were clear upon beginning the program compared with 66% for the previous year.

Year-to-year comparisons of the duration of the program show little change with respondents of both periods reporting the time spent as desirable.

TABLE V

PERCEPTIONS OF DURATION

	Too long	Just right	Not long enough
78-79	8.0%	78%	14%
77-78	10.5%	68%	21%

The improved percentages of those reporting "just right" may be due to better direction, or clearer expectation; the reasons are not clear. However, such change must be recognized as positive change.

Opportunities for participants who were not satisfied with the duration to offer alternative time spans brought suggestions of three days from three participants, five or more days from an equal number, and one reported "continuous."

Understanding other cultures was reported to have increased by 81% of the respondents while 14% said their understanding did not increase and 5% couldn't say.

A related question as to whether their attitude toward other cultures had changed drew a 28% positive response, a 47% negative response and 25% couldn't say.

One can speculate at length about the relationship between attitude and understanding, but we will not other than to observe that they are intricately related. In any event any change in attitude or growth in understanding must be viewed as a positive outcome of the program.

Specific attitude changes that were reported included greater respect for accomplishments, the educational system of other cultures, and changes that just could not be articulated.

Twenty percent of the principals indicated that teachers had reported attitude changes that could be attributed to their participation. Others (46.6%) had received no such reports, and 33.3% couldn't say.

Good responses were also reported regarding the format of the workshop. On the same type of scale the percentages reported are shown in the following table:

TABLE VI

FORMAT OF THE WORKSHOP

Too structured, too guided	0%	3%	91%	3%	3%	Too unstructured, too unguided

Evidently the format requires no modification to please the participants. Only seven responses were made to a question asking for suggested changes in format, connoting a further indication of satisfaction. Of these suggestions,

one wanted more materials on attitudes and values and guidance on how to use them. Another wanted a list of materials that had already been developed and an opportunity to study them before coming while yet another wanted to use a team approach to unit development. The other comments related to materials rather than format.

Again in 78-79 most of the units developed were in social studies. Of the 47 topics mentioned, 21 were in social studies. Other commonly cited subject areas were music (10), values (5), language arts (3), and a lesser number in art, economics, geography, science and math.

A wide array of instructional methods was used to present the units. Although the methods used defy summation, 33.3% reported that they used different methods than their usual instructional methods. This compares very favorably when contrasted with the 19% from the previous year that reported using different methods.

Teachers were also rather satisfied with the instructional units that they constructed and used as shown in the following table:

TABLE VII

SATISFACTION WITH INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT

78-79	Very pleased	59%	23%	15%	3%	0%	Very disappointed
77-78	Euphoric	12%	43%	39%	10%	0%	Devastated

Admittedly since the extremes used for the two years are not the same, a direct comparison cannot be made. It should be pointed out that radical extremes tend to cause respondents to report a more conservative observation, as was probably the case in 77-78. However, the table does clearly demonstrate that the units are something the teachers are proud of. This is further

affirmed by the 67% who reported that they had shared their instructional unit with others in their school. Presumably units that were developed late in the year were less apt to be shared than units that were available for a longer period of time.

As discussed in the program description above, the Center specialist conducted followup visits to the teachers' classrooms as the units were being taught. In view of the time allocated to this visit and the mixed reaction of the previous year, a question related to the perceived value of that followup was posed. Results are shown for the 25 respondents who had presumably been visited. (Obviously units that were developed too late in the year for this year's utilization were not included in the visitation schedule.)

TABLE VIII

PERCEIVED VALUE OF FOLLOWUP VISITS

78-79	Very helpful	16%	20%	20%	16%	28%	Not helpful
77-78	Extremely helpful	19%	26%	36%	11%	8%	A nuisance

Again a direct comparison of responses by years cannot be made because of the blatant descriptors used the first year and the implications of that as discussed earlier. There is some genuine concern that must be expressed, however, about whether the visitation is a viable component of the program. Further investigation to assess the reasons for these perceptions would be desirable. Ten of the respondents indicated that fewer followups would be desirable, one reported more, and one reported the same number as desirable.

Added to the Center activities in 78-79 were components of field trips, artists-in-residents and motivational consultants. Teachers were asked to

indicate those that they used and to rate them. Thirteen teachers reported using the artists-in-residence and all but one gave very positive comments. Five reported using field trips and all observations were supportive, as were the four who indicated use of motivational consultants.

A few respondents expressed concern that they did not know about the availability of such resources.

Accessing the materials after they had been developed continues to be a problem but not as severe a concern as that of the previous year as shown on the following table:

TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE REPORTING DIFFICULTIES IN GETTING MATERIALS

	Yes	No	Haven't used yet
78-79	22%	65%	13%
77-78	36%	56%	8%

Almost all who cited specific difficulties mentioned that some other teacher in the district had checked it out when the developing teacher wanted it while one cited clerical errors and one mentioned that it was being held at the Center to show visitors.

Although only one principal cited difficulties with the scheduling arrangement of the MCC and few teachers complained about being away from their classroom for the four-day block of time, alternate scheduling is a possibility. However, only 21% of the teachers would be willing to participate after regular school hours, 52% reported they would not and 27% said after school participation would be conditional. Specific conditional considerations were not well defined.

Most teachers (88%) indicated that they would like their personnel file to acknowledge professional development from their participation in the Center activities.

As was the case the first year, teachers gave a strong endorsement to the program by reporting that 77% had encouraged fellow teachers to participate in the Multi-Cultural Center. The initial year showed 75% had done so.

Recommendations for improving the Center drew some interesting observations. The most frequent (six) of these was to add more materials and some cited particular acquisitions that are desired such as music and materials for the primary grades.

Others listed a need for an annotated bibliography to help teachers throughout the district to access the materials. There were also suggestions for having the Center open at night and during the summer for teachers to browse and check out holdings.

Related suggestions indicated that the Center should be located more centrally in the district and that it should be near the Instructional Materials Center. At least one principal thought it should be combined with the IMC.

The addition of a research librarian was also suggested as was a list of resource people who would be willing to visit schools.

One respondent thought that more time should be allocated to the exchange of ideas and teaching methodologies relating to other cultures.

Clarification of expectations, addition of secondary teachers and advancement on the salary schedule were also suggested.

Principals were generally familiar with the Center, for 14 of the 15 who indicated that their teachers participated, had discussed the MCC program with those teachers upon the teachers return to school. Thirteen of those principals reported to have visited a class that was using a unit developed at the Center. Only six had visited the Center, but five indicated

a desire to and one wrote that it had given him an idea and that he was going to do so next year.

When principals were asked if they had any suggestions for improving the program a few took the opportunity to praise the program and one specifically mentioned a very successful PTA program built around the MCC.

Another suggested combining it with the Instructional Materials Center. There was some indication that one respondent perceived the materials as being somewhat restricted from use by teachers who did not participate in the Center.

Concluding Observations and Recommendations

There is a high degree of satisfaction expressed by those who participated in Center activities, and few problems on which to base recommendations appear serious. Nevertheless, some recommendations do emerge and some concerns are implied. Perhaps the most definite need for change is in the followup visits while the unit is being taught. In view of the rather substantial number who saw little or no value to these visits, allowing the teachers to decide if they want a followup visit may be in order. This could save some valuable time for the Center specialist.

The materials listings should be continually expanded to include all subjects and all levels of resources. By the same token, maximum utilization of existing materials, including developed units, can be made by advertising the listings more widely. As was suggested by some of the respondents, an annotated bibliography of available materials widely circulated throughout the district may increase interest in and use of these resources.

Some recognition for attendance could easily and inexpensively be brought about by developing a certificate of attendance for participants and inserting documentation of such participation in the teacher's personnel file.

As the Multi-Cultural Center continues to expand and refine its resources, there should be an increasing demand for the materials and services of the Center. This indicates that the location and schedule should be arranged for maximum access by all teachers of the district. With the present staff and in the present location there are some limitations on availability. Serious consideration should be given to locating the Center more centrally in the district and perhaps next to or as a part of the Instructional Materials Center. This would allow combined efforts to facilitate more flexible hours and may have other benefits such as shared effort in duplicating and disseminating materials.

A latent concern is the nature of the participants-or perhaps more accurately, the nature of those who do not participate. While recognizing that some principals have been very supportive of the Center and have encouraged their teachers to participate, it appears that some schools are underrepresented in Center activities. It may well be that the teachers who need to participate most are those who are least apt to volunteer. While not having a specific recommendation for identifying and recruiting those teachers, it is suggested that an analysis be made of those schools where participation rates are low. Such an analysis may provide clues as to what action is necessary to involve those teachers in the program.

As mentioned earlier, attitude change is very difficult to bring about in the short run unless the exposure is very dramatic. While recognizing that positive attitude change is desirable, and indeed was reported by over twenty-five percent of the respondents, it is suggested that stating attitude change as a goal of the program may be unrealistic. Failure to observe this change, as was the case this year, may detract from what all other indicators point out to be a very successful program. If, however, attitude change is to be maintained as part of the program's objectives,

other, more intensive activities such as home visitations, role playing and more sociological theory on the acquisition and influence of values should become an integral part of the Center activity.

APPENDIXES

The Survey Instruments

May 7, 1979

MEMORANDUM

TO: Principals

FROM: Roger W. Huson
Title VII Director

SUBJECT: Title VII Evaluation

Please respond to the following items regarding Title VII activities that may have affected your school. Return the questionnaire to me by May 18th. Thanks for your help on this.

Diagnostic/Prescriptive Specialists

1. How much involvement have you had with this program?

   ____Much ____Some ____None

2. How well coordinated is this program with other programs to help individual learning problems?

   ____Very well ____Somewhat ____Little or none ____Can't say

3. Do teachers generally feel that the prescriptions that are prepared by the DPS staff are appropriate?

   ____Usually ____Sometimes ____Seldom ____Can't say

4. Are the teachers generally supportive of the DPS program?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

5. Do the DPS staff and the classroom teacher work well together?

   ____Yes ____Sometimes ____No ____Can't say

6. Is the followup of referred students prompt?

   ____Yes ____Sometimes ____No ____Can't say

7. Would you like to see the DPS staff spend more time in your building?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

8. Should the DPS staff follow a set schedule in your building?

   ____Yes ____No ____Depends on other factors

9. What one recommendation would you make to improve the program?

   _____

Student Relations Specialists

1. How much involvement have you had with this program?

   ___Much ___Some ___None

2. How well coordinated is this program with other programs to help similar referrals?

   ___Very well ___Somewhat ___Little or none ___Can't say

3. Does the SRS staff provide adequate feedback to teachers?

   ___Yes ___Sometimes ___No ___Can't say

4. Is the followup of referred students prompt?

   ___Yes ___Sometimes ___No ___Can't say

5. Does the visitation schedule synchronize with the school schedule?

   ___Yes ___Sometimes ___No ___Can't say

6. Should the SRS staff spend more time in your building? ___Yes ___No

7. What one recommendation would you make to improve the program?

   _____

   _____

Multi-Cultural Center (Leave Blank If No Teachers Participated)

1. Have you discussed this program with participating teachers upon their return to school?

   ___Yes ___No

2. Have you visited a class that was using the instructional unit developed at the MCC?

   ___Yes ___No ___Can't say

3. Have any teachers reported attitude changes as a result of the MCC program?

   ___Yes ___No ___Can't say

4. Did the schedule for inservice synchronize with your school's schedule?

   ___Yes ___No ___Can't say

   5. If no, how could it have been rearranged to minimize conflicts?

      _____

      _____

6. Have you visited the Multi-Cultural Center this year?

____Yes ____No ____Can't say

7. Would you like to visit the Center?

____Yes ____No ____Uncertain

8. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program?

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS:

May 7, 1979

Dear

We are evaluating the Multi-Cultural Center as a component of our Title VII program. This is to find ways in which the program can be of greater service and to comply with funding requirements.

Please take a few minutes to respond to this questionnaire before mailing it in the enclosed envelope to our staff consultants at SSU. Only they will know the respondent's name, so please be candid.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Huson

Roger W. Huson
Title VII Director

1. How do you feel about the duration of the inservice phase at Matheny?

   ____Too long ____Just right ____Not long enough

2. If not "just right," how long should it be?_____

3. Were your expectations clear upon beginning the program?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

4. Rate the materials that you worked with at the Center on the following dimensions:

   Very Adequate ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very Inadequate

   Very Appropriate ____ ____ ____ ____ _____ Very Inappropriate

5. Rate the staff assistance that was available to you at the Center.

   Very Sufficient ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very Insufficient

6. Did your understanding of other cultures increase as a result of the workshop?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

7. Did your attitude toward other cultures change as a result of the workshop?

____Yes ____No ____Can't say

If yes, in what way?_____

_____

_____

8. Rate the format of the workshop.

Too structured, too guided ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Too unstructured, too unguided

9. What change in format or content would you recommend to improve the workshop?_____

_____

10. What grade level was the instructional unit that you developed? _____

11. What subject area(s) did it contain?_____

_____

12. What instructional methods were used when you presented your unit to your class?_____

_____

13. Were these methods in any way different from your usual instructional methods?

____Yes ____No

14. Rate the degree of satisfaction that you felt with the instructional unit.

Very pleased ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very disappointed

15. Have you shared your instructional unit with others in your school?

____Yes ____No

If yes, with whom (position)?_____

_____

16. Have you had any scheduling difficulties in getting materials from the Center?

____Yes ____No ____Haven't used

If yes, what was the nature of the difficulty?_____

_____

17. Rate the value to you of the followup visit(s) by the Multi-Cultural Center staff to see your unit in progress.

Very helpful ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Not helpful

18. Would you like more or fewer followup visits by the staff?

_____

19. Some new components of the Multi-Cultural Center program this year were field trips, artists-in-residence, and a motivational consultant. If you utilized any of these new resources, please indicate which ones and briefly rate them.

_____

_____

_____

20. Have you encouraged fellow teachers to participate in the Multi-Cultural Center?

____Yes ____No ____Can't recall

21. Would you be willing to participate in a MCC workshop if it were to be held after regular school hours?

____Yes ____No ____Conditionally_____
(Please specify)

22. Would you like your personnel file to acknowledge the professional development from participating in the MCC workshop?

____Yes ____No

23. What would you recommend to improve the MCC program?

_____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS:

May 4, 1979

Dear Teacher,

We are evaluating our Title VII Diagnostic/Prescriptive Specialist program to comply with the requirements of that Title and to see what improvements we can make in the program. Our DPS team this year was composed of Connie Byerly, Marilyn Cobb, Gloria Neutzling, Rosemary Reichstetter, Laurie Farrell, Carol Taylor, Pamela Sabich and Sharon Schachtsiek.

Please take a few moments to respond to this questionnaire before mailing it to our evaluation consultants at SSU. Only they will know the respondent's name, so please be candid.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Huson

Roger W. Huson
Title VII Director

1. How many students have you referred to the Diagnostic/Prescriptive Specialists this year?_____

2. How accurate do you feel the diagnosis of your students' learning problems were?

   ____Very ____Fairly ____Not Very ____Can't say

3. How appropriate were the prescribed programs for the students' needs?

   ____Very ____Fairly ____Not very ____Can't say

4. Is the Title VII aide's schedule compatible with your classroom schedule?

   ____Yes ____No

   If not, what are the scheduling problems?_____

   _____

5. Does the DPS who visits your school spend enough time diagnosing, prescribing, and revising each case?

   ____Always ____Usually ____Sometimes ____Seldom ____Never

6. Of the following inservice activities that could be provided by the DPS staff, rank order the three that you would prefer. Indicate by 1, 2, and 3.

___sequencing learning activities

___developing and utilizing learning stations

___developing learning games

___identification of learning difficulties

___parental involvement in teaching/learning

___other (specify) _____

7. To what extent do parents provide feedback on their children's involvement with the DPS staff?

___Usually ___Sometimes ___Seldom ___Never

8. How positive is this feedback?

___Very positive ___Somewhat positive ___Mixed

___Somewhat negative ___Very negative

9. What do you feel the primary responsibilities of the Title VII aide are?

_____

_____

10. To what extent do you depend on the Title VII aide to work with referred students?

___To a great extent ___To some extent ___Very little ___Not at all

11. What obstacles do you see that prevent greater utilization of the aide?

_____

_____

12. What recommendations would you make to improve the DPS program?

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS:

May 4, 1979

Dear

In order to improve the Title VII desegregation efforts, we need to evaluate this year's program. Please respond to the following questions, and mail the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Only the staff consultants at SSU will know the individual respondents. You are assured anonymity, so please respond candidly.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Huson
Title VII Director

1. Please indicate the approximate hours per week that you spend on each of the following activities. Feel free to add as many as necessary.

_____Filling in reports for Title VII _____Substituting for regular staff

_____Doing clerical work for teachers _____Dealing with parents

_____Supervising lunch and playground _____School bus monitoring

_____Helping students with learning activities

_____Other (specify)_____

_____Other (specify)_____

2. To whom do you feel most responsible:

_____Principal _____Title VII staff _____A selected teacher _____Other

3. Who has the most influence on your workday routine:

___Principal ___A designated teacher ___Title VII staff ___Students ___Others

3. Do the teachers in your building understand your role and responsibilities?

_____Yes _____No _____Mixed or don't know

4. Does your principal understand your role and responsibilities as you understand them?

_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

6. Do you have job experiences as an aide (tricks of the trade) that might be beneficial to your peers in other schools of the district?

_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

7. If convenient, would you like to exchange ideas with your peers?

_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

8. What particular knowledge, skills or abilities do you feel would help you do a better job?

_____

_____

9. What are the biggest problems you face in doing your job?

_____

_____

10. What suggestions would you make to improve the Title VII programs?

_____

_____

_____

11. What topics would you like to see included in an in-service training program?

_____ _____

_____ _____

OTHER COMMENTS:

May 4, 1979

Dear Teacher,

We are evaluating the Student Relations Specialist component of our Title VII program. This is to find ways in which the program can be of greater service and to comply with funding expectations.

The student relations staff this year was composed of Eula Alexander, Martha Bradley, Peg Colter, Honey Hutton, Larry Moose, Annette Nelson, Elizabeth Nelson, and Edna Walden.

Please take a few minutes to respond to this questionnaire before mailing it in the enclosed envelope to our staff consultants at SSU. Only they will know the respondent's name so please be candid.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Huson

Roger W. Huson
Title VII Director

1. How many students have you referred to Student Relations Specialists this year? _____

2. How quick was the followup of the SRS staff in contacting your referred student(s)?

   ___Very ___Fairly ___Not very ___Varies

3. How productive has the SRS been in working with you to help your referred student?

   ___Very ___Fairly ___Not very ___Can't say

4. In what way could the SRS be of greater help in working with the referred student(s)?_____

   _____

5. In general, how many times per week would be desirable for the SRS's to work with a student?_____

6. In general, how do you feel about the amount of time the student who is working with the SRS spends each session out of your class?

   ___Too much time is spent

   ___Too little time is spent

   ___The right amount of time is spent

   ___The amount of time spent doesn't matter to me

7. Does the SRS visitation schedule synchronize with your classroom schedule? _____ If not, what are the scheduling problems?

_____

_____

8. Have you recommended to other teachers that they refer students to the SRS staff?

____Yes ____No

9. Overall, how would you rate the SRS activity in helping students you have referred?

____Extremely helpful ____Somewhat helpful ____Not Very helpful

____Of no help ____Can't say

10. What suggestions would you make to improve the program?

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS:

May 4, 1979

Dear Parent,

As you know a Student Relations Specialist has worked with your child this school year. To evaluate that program, we would like to get your views of benefits and activities.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return in the self-addressed envelope. You will not be identified in any way.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Huson
Title VII Director

1. How many times has the Student Relations Specialist visited with you? _____

2. Would you like more contact with the Student Relations Specialist?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

3. Do you feel that the Student Relations Specialist has worked with your child frequently enough?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

4. Do you understand your child better as a result of the SRS program?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

5. Is your relationship with your child better as a result of the program?

   ____Yes ____No ____Can't say

6. How beneficial has the program been for your child?

   ____Very beneficial ____Of some benefit ____Of little benefit

   ____No benefit ____Can't say

7. How would you rate the overall value of the SRS program?

   ____Extremely valuable ____Of considerable value ____Of little value

   ____No value ____Can't say

OTHER COMMENTS: